

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

TROY SLACK, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SWIFT TRANSPORTATION CO. OF
ARIZONA, LLC,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C11-5843 BHS

ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Swift Transportation Co. of Arizona, LLC's ("Swift") motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 203). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby grants the motion for the reasons stated herein.

I. PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL HISTORY

On September 15, 2016, Plaintiffs Eric Dublinski, Richard Erickson, Sean P. Forney, Jacob Grismer, Timothy Helmick, Henry M. Ledesma, Scott Praye, Gary H. Roberts, Troy Slack, Dennis Stuber, and Robert P. Ulrich ("Plaintiffs") filed a motion to compel requesting that the Court either order Swift to produce certain documents withheld and identified on Swift's privilege log or conduct an *in camera* review of the documents. Dkt. 190. Plaintiffs identified two categories of documents, which are pay analysis documents and communications regarding overtime. *Id.* at 10–15. On

1 November 15, 2016, the Court granted the motion and ordered Swift to produce the pay
2 analysis documents and submit the remainder of the documents for *in camera* review.
3 Dkt. 201. On November 17, 2016, Swift filed a motion for partial reconsideration
4 requesting that all documents be submitted for *in camera* review. Dkt. 203.

5 II. DISCUSSION

6 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will usually not be granted without
7 allowing the opposing party an opportunity to respond. Local Rules, W.D. Wash. LCR
8 7(h)(1)-(2). In this case, the Court finds that a response is not required because granting
9 the motion is in the interest of all parties. The Court has concluded that the pay analysis
10 documents should be produced and, absent some extraordinary turn of events or
11 discovery of some fact that the Court is currently unaware of, the Court will order
12 production of the documents in due course. Thus, no party is prejudiced by Swift
13 submitting the documents to the Court.

14 III. ORDER

15 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Swift's motion for reconsideration (Dkt.
16 203) is **GRANTED**. Swift shall submit the documents for *in camera* review as soon as
17 practicable.

18 Dated this 1st day of December, 2016.

19
20 

21 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
22 United States District Judge

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22